

DCAC Summary Report for 2012-13

Current Membership:

Chuck Phillips (Chair), Ronald S Bakari, Carrie E Dunham-LaGree, Jerome A Hilscher, Todd Hodgkinson, Nancy Reincke, Kathleen Richardson, Amy G Vaughan (replacing Royce Fichtner)
Ex officio: Art Sanders, Kevin Saunders, Stephanie N Majeran

Overview:

The DCAC has made significant progress during the 2012-13 year. The committee met throughout the year: a total of six times. DCAC focused on:

- developing working precepts of what the Drake Curriculum (DC) Assessment Plan will focus on.
- developing the Assessment Plan in collaboration with Art Sanders' and Kevin Saunders' offices
- creating an inventory of current assessment being conducted with the Drake Curriculum
- moving the work of the committee to a review body that initiates review of data and campus discussions for continual improvement of the.

Progress to date:

- **AOI Review Timeline:** DCAC has developed a timeline of AOI review that coincides with the UCC review of AOI courses (two per academic year). This timeline must take into account the idea that work on other AOIs (other than the two being focused on in a given year) must occur as we work on developing the assessment plan and pieces of evidence used in the plan.
- **General Philosophy:** DCAC discussed the approaches to the assessment of the DC (general philosophical approach). Generally speaking, assessment of DC outcomes will need to be implemented through multiple methods of investigation over multiple years. Data will be both direct and indirect and include the use of rubrics, surveys and self-assessments, integration of both qualitative and quantitative data, integration of curricular and co-curricular evidence, use of national benchmark data, working with faculty to gather embedded data and data that would be meaningful to them, with the focus on using that data for campus conversations on improvement. Evidence of progress over time should be pursued while realizing that FYS and senior capstones cannot sustain the majority of assessment efforts.
- **Critical Thinking (CT):** CT and Information Literacy were areas that had previously been targeted for initial assessment work. DCAC created an inventory of what has been done up until now, what data is available, and what process will be used to share the data and act on it.

DCAC reviewed the data from the FYS critical thinking assessment. Students seem to struggle with "evidence" and "arguments" components in CT. That data has also been

reviewed by a faculty group who made recommendations (3) related to improving student arguments with evidence support and assumptions/alternatives to improve higher-level thinking and for improvement in assignment designs to promote the higher-level thinking. This is somewhat supported by CT data from the Drake data from the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA). DCAC has also reviewed related data from the NSSE and the Drake Survey.

Formal recommendations by DCAC have been forwarded to Associate Provost Sanders and the Director of Institutional Research and Academic Assessment, Kevin Saunders. (See Appendix A)

- **Information literacy (IL):** The IL working group is in its 3rd year of the project with 10 FYS instructors. There is a rubric but it has not yet been endorsed by Senate. A baseline assessment of students in the first month of FYS is followed with 2 sessions with library faculty in FYS and then an end-point analysis with the rubric.

A group of 5 faculty applied the rubric last fall to student samples. The rubric was revised by the group and by Kevin Saunders and Stephanie Majeran. They are working to apply the revised rubric to student work gathered from FYS 2012. This will occur in May for piloting the revised tool. The plan then is to integrate the rubric into faculty development in August or earlier. In addition, Kevin's office is gathering what indirect measures of Information Literacy we currently have.

- **Global and Cultural Understanding (GCU):** Five faculty who teach in that GCU AOI's courses responded to a request to discuss ways to determine student achievement of the intended learning outcomes for the AOI. The first meeting was 'what's our task'. The group is now looking at senate approved outcomes and what would be desirable in student work to quantify those outcomes. The group has continued to meet this spring to develop an assessment tool. They plan to sit down with a broader group of faculty and gain feedback.

- **Experiential learning (EL)** Kevin Saunder's office has begun developing a tool to assess the experiential learning and engaged citizen AOIs. The tools were used at the experiential learning and engaged citizen showcase in the spring of 2013.

- **Quantitative Literacy (QL):** This week, Kevin Saunder's office sent a query to faculty teaching in QL AOI courses. Volunteers were requested for helping determine what Drake would want to see in student work to quantify the outcomes. This process is parallel to the work on Global/Cultural Understanding.

- **Other efforts:** Reviewing other campus projects such as the Teagle development program that could be used to enhance the assessment of the Engaged Citizen outcome. This project's end-date will coincide with the committee's review of the engaged citizen AOI in 2013-14.

In addition, the committee fulfilled the request by Senate to report on our efforts. This update occurred at the December 2012 Faculty Senate meeting.

Summary:

The committee has created a structure by which the assessment of the Drake Curriculum can be applied. Although time consuming, the process has built faculty buy-in to the assessment of the DC, supports individual faculty without undo burden or work, and focuses on evidence to incrementally improve the DC. Data from the process, as well as action steps by DCAC should be considered for implementation into the accreditation documents for HLC in 2016-17.

Appendix A:

CT Formal Recommendations

Recommendations:

A. DCAC recommends Associate Provost Sanders and the Director of Institutional Research and Academic Assessment, Kevin Saunders: Continue with CT assessment through the use of the CT rubric in FYS and continue to gather examples of Drake assignments that align with the rubric.

We suggest that the CT workshop on designing assignments should be continued and should use the rubric as a tool for designing assignments which gauge student learning. The workshops should also address creating assignments in the areas DU students seem to need additional work: Making assumptions and using evidence. The workshops should occur prior to the traditional fall time period so as not to be too late for FYS instructors to integrate into their fall FYS courses. Further consideration should be given, and discussed with the UCC, for having the rubric required as part of the AOI course approval process.

B. The Director of Institutional Research and Academic Assessment office should contact people teaching senior capstones in an effort to gather current embedded assignments that would match with the CT outcome. The intent is to use the CT rubric with a sample of those and compare outcomes from freshman to senior years.

C. The Associate Provost and the Director of Institutional Research and Academic Assessment offices should distribute the CT rubric and current CT findings across campus. DCAC recommends distribution to the UCC, faculty senate (end of year update), to faculty teaching CT AOI courses, to the broader campus (in a newsletter and/or email to faculty/departments, and/or through the Provost's email update with a weblink). DCAC recommends the rubric and results be posted on the DC website for access by the Drake community.

D. The Associate Provost and the Director of Institutional Research and Academic Assessment offices should investigate the creation of a faculty toolkit for implementing CT exercises and assessment into courses by working with the CT working-group on what would be useful in the toolkit.